

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The office action of February 25, 2004 has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-3, 5-11, 15-24, 26, 28-32 and 36-56 remain pending in this application.

Claims 1-3, 5-11, 15-19, 28-32 and 36-56 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent no. 5,727,155 to Dawson ("Dawson") in view of U.S. patent no. 6,446,111 to Lowery ("Lowery"). Claims 20-24 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dawson. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Preliminarily, applicants respectfully request that to the extent that the rejections set forth below are maintained, the Examiner specifically rebut of each of applicants' position.

Claims 1-3, 5-11, 15-19, 37-46 and 56

Claim 1 calls for, among other features, a personal computer, a main display unit, and an auxiliary display unit configured to receive second information associated with a second application launched by the personal computer, wherein the second information is displayed on the display of the auxiliary display unit and not on the main display unit.

The action acknowledges that Dawson does not teach "second information being displayed on the display of the auxiliary display unit and not on the main display unit". To overcome this deficiency, the action relies on Lowery.

Applicants agree that Lowery shows in Fig. 1 a client/server system 10 showing a client 12 coupled to a server 18 through a communication link 16 and describes the use of "plug-ins", which are typically external modules or add-on programs run on client. Notwithstanding this common ground, applicants submit that the combination of Dawson and Lowery proposed in the action, even if proper, does not result in the invention of claim 1.

The action contends that it would have been obvious to modify Dawson's multi-computer system to adapt the external modules described in Lowery in that the external modules equivalently provide the desired display on the auxiliary unit. Irrespective of whether one skilled

in the art would have been motivated to modify Lowery in the manner suggested in the action, the combination would not have resulted in the claim 1 invention.

Specifically, the combination of Dawson and Lowery does not provide a teaching or suggestion of an auxiliary display unit configured to receive *second information associated with a second application launched by the personal computer*, wherein the second information is displayed on the display of the auxiliary display unit and not on the main display unit. Dawson merely shows that applications can be displayed on the remote system display 230 outside the shared display 216. However, these applications are local applications which are executed by the CPU 310 of the remote system 220 and not by the CPU 305 of the host system 300. Col. 6, ll. 58-61; Fig. 3. The external modules described in Lowery amount to nothing more than local applications, which are executed on the client computer. Indeed, Lowery says as much at col. 5, lines 22-28. Notably, Lowery states “[p]lug-ins are typically external modules or add-on programs *run on the client* which are used to provide various abilities.” (Emphasis supplied). Thus, Lowery does not receive second information associated with a second *application launched by the personal computer*, wherein the second information is displayed on the display of the auxiliary display unit and not on the main display unit.

In one aspect, the claim 1 invention provides an auxiliary display unit in a computer system in addition to a main display unit in order to display certain information normally displayed by the main display unit. A benefit which may be realized by this aspect is that application display information can be routed to the auxiliary display unit, so that valuable primary screen display real estate may be made available for use with another application. Neither Dawson nor Lowery contemplate a system, which can achieve these results.

For at least the foregoing reason, the combination of Dawson and Lowery, even if proper, does not result in the claim 1 invention. Claims 2, 3, 5-11, 15-19, 37-46 and 56, which ultimately depend from claim 1, are considered allowable for the same reasons set forth above and further in view of the additional novel features recited therein.

For example, Dawson lacks a teaching or suggestion of the claim 2 invention where the personal computer, the main display unit and the auxiliary display unit are integrated together in

a single physical structure. The action takes the implausible position that because Dawson's host system and remote system are connected by a conventional telephone wire they are somehow integrated together in a single physical structure. However, Dawson shows that the host system and remote system are part of standalone units, separated from each other in two distinct physical structures and not integrated together in a single physical structure. Figure 2 and p. 10, ll. 10-15 of applicants' specification shows and describes an illustrative embodiment of the claim 2 invention where the personal computer is physically integrated with a main display unit 207 and auxiliary display unit 307. Lowery fails to overcome this deficiency of Dawson.

Claim 17 recites that the personal computer is configured to dynamically control which information the second auxiliary display unit receives by determining whether the second auxiliary display unit is capable of providing display functionality for the information. While Dawson describes providing different levels of access to information, Dawson does not provide any teaching or suggestion of dynamically controlling which information the second auxiliary display unit receives by determining whether the second auxiliary display unit is capable of providing the display functionality for the information. Moreover, Dawson is wholly devoid of any teaching or suggestion of determining whether the second auxiliary display unit has sufficient display space available to receive the first or second information as recited in claim 18. To show this feature of claim 18, the action points to col. 10, ll. 37-40 of Dawson. However, this disclosure of Dawson neither teaches nor suggests determining whether sufficient display space is available. Rather this portion of Dawson describes that if the GDI cannot perform a display task directly, then the remote application calls display driver 370 to assist in performing the display task. Lowery does not remedy this defect of Dawson.

Claim 38 recites that the input user interface is configured to receive user authorization information from a user, the user authorization information being processed to determine whether the user is authorized to change a variable associated with the second application. Claim 39 recites that the input user interface is configured to receive user authorization information from a user, the user authorization information being processed to determine a level of interaction with the second application for which the user is authorized. To show the features of claims 38 and 39, the action relies on Dawson's disclosure of access control at col. 7, ll. 2-5.

Dawson describes access control, which is set at the host system and which may pertain to the level of access the remote system may have with respect to an application. Namely, Dawson determines the level of access on an application basis *not* on a user basis. In contrast, claim 38 and 39 are directed to the input user interface, which is part of the auxiliary display unit, receiving user authorization information from a user and processing the user authorization information to determine 1) whether that user is authorized to change a variable associated with the second application as recited in claim 38 or 2) a level of interaction with the second application for which the user is authorized as recited in claim 39. Dawson fails to describe, teach or suggest receiving authorization information from a user and determining what that specific user can do with respect to an application. Lowery fails to overcome these deficiencies associated with Dawson.

Claim 46 calls for the auxiliary display unit being physically attachable to a user. The action has failed to identify a teaching or suggestion of this feature. The action indicates that Dawson provides a host system and remote system being connected by conventional modems and connection line. Yet this disclosure is wholly unrelated to the claim 46 feature of the auxiliary display unit being physically attachable to a user.

Claims 28-32

Independent claim 28 is directed to a method for use in a computer system having a host computer, a main display unit coupled to the host computer, and an auxiliary display unit coupled to the host computer, the auxiliary display unit being a standalone unit including a display and an input user interface. The method includes, among other features, displaying first information associated with an active application on the main display unit; displaying a graphical user interface associated with the active application on the display of the standalone auxiliary display unit, and not on the main display unit; receiving an input from a user through the input user interface of the standalone auxiliary display unit, the input requesting second information associated with the active application; and displaying the second information on the display of the standalone auxiliary display unit, and not on the main display unit in response to the input.

The action apparently applies the combination of Dawson and Lowery used to reject claim 1 in a similar manner to reject claim 28. Thus, the action acknowledges that Dawson lacks a teaching or suggestion of 1) displaying first information associated with an active application on the main display unit and displaying a graphical user interface portion associated with the active application on the display of the auxiliary display unit and not on the main display unit as recited in claim 28; and 2) displaying the second information associated with the active application on the display of the standalone auxiliary display unit, and not on the main display unit in response to the input as called for in claim 28. To overcome this deficiency, the action applies Lowery as applied to claim 1.

Nonetheless, the combination of Dawson and Lowery does not provide a teaching or suggestion of displaying first information associated with an *active application on the main display unit* and displaying a graphical user interface portion associated with the active application on the display of the auxiliary display unit and not on the main display unit. Nor does the combination teach or suggest displaying *the second information associated with the active application* on the display of the standalone auxiliary display unit, and not on the main display unit in response to the input.

According to Dawson, the display of an application shared by the host system and remote system “is duplicated as shared display 216 on the remote system 220”. Col. 6, ll. 54-55; Fig. 2. If the application is not shared and local to the remote system 220 (run by CPU 310), Dawson shows that the entire application content is only displayed on the display 230 outside of the shared display 216. Col. 6, ll. 54-61; Figs. 2 and 3. Further, as discussed above, Dawson merely shows that applications can be displayed on the remote system display 230 outside the shared display 216. However, these applications are local applications which are executed by the CPU 310 of the remote system 220 and not by the CPU 305 of the host system 300. Col. 6, ll. 58-61; Fig. 3. The external modules described in Lowery amount to nothing more than local applications, which are executed on the client computer and their output displayed on the client computers. Indeed, Lowery says as much at col. 5, lines 22-28. Notably, Lowery states “[p]lugins are typically external modules or add-on programs *run on the client* which are used to

provide various abilities.” (Emphasis supplied). Thus, Lowery does not satisfy the aforementioned recitations of claim 28.

In an illustrative implementation of the claim 28 invention, a user can insert a CD into the host computer, where the host computer is configured to launch a soft UI applet and route the UI applet for display on the display auxiliary display unit rather than the display screen of the main display unit. Neither Dawson nor Lowery fathom anything remotely similar to such a scenario.

For at least the above reasons, independent claim 28 is patentably distinct from the art of record. Claims 29-32, which ultimately depend from claim 28, are considered allowable for the same reasons set forth above and further in view of the additional novel features recited therein.

Claim 36

Claim 36 is directed to a computer network including a server and plural computer systems coupled to the server. Each computer system includes a host computer, a main display unit, coupled to and controlled by the host computer, the main display unit configured to receive first information associated with a first application launched by the host computer and display the first information; and an auxiliary display unit coupled to and controlled by the host computer and distinct from the main display unit, the auxiliary display unit physically remote from the main display unit and configured to receive second information associated with a second application launched by the host computer. The auxiliary display unit includes a display for displaying the second information, and an input user interface dedicated to the auxiliary display unit and configured to receive inputs allowing user interaction with the second application in response to the second information being displayed on the display, wherein the second information is displayed on the display of the auxiliary display unit and not on the main display unit.

The action applies the combination of Dawson and Lowery to reject claim 36 similar to the rejection of claim 1. According to claim 36, the host computer controls both the main display unit and the auxiliary display unit. The combination of Dawson and Lowery does not teach or suggest the second information being displayed on the display of the auxiliary display unit and not on the main display unit, where both the main display unit and auxiliary display unit are

controlled by the host computer. For at least this reason and for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1 to the extent they are applicable, claim 36 is patentably distinct from the combination of Dawson and Lowery.

Claims 47-53

Independent claim 47 calls for, among other features, a personal computer; a main display unit coupled to the personal computer, the main display unit configured to receive and display first information associated with a first active application on the personal computer; and an auxiliary display unit coupled to the personal computer and distinct from the main display unit, the auxiliary display unit configured to receive second information from an external network associated with a second active application operating on the personal computer. According to claim 47, the auxiliary display unit includes a display for displaying the second information, wherein the second information is not displayed on the main display unit, a processing unit for receiving and processing instructions received from the personal computer, and a modem configured to couple the auxiliary display unit to the external network responsive to the instructions received by the processing unit from the personal computer, without connecting to the external network through the personal computer.

The action acknowledges that Dawson does not describe, teach or otherwise suggest a shared application scenario in which an auxiliary display unit receives second information from an external network associated with an application being run on the personal computer, wherein the second information is not displayed on the main display unit. To overcome this deficiency, the action relies on Lowery.

Although Lowery shows in Fig. 1 a client/server system 10 showing a client 12 coupled to a server 18 through a communication link 16 and describes the use of “plug-ins”, which are typically external modules or add-on programs run on client, the combination of Dawson and Lowery proposed in the action does not result in the invention of claim 47. As discussed with respect to claim 1, the action contends that it would have been obvious to modify Dawson’s multi-computer system to adapt the external modules described in Lowery in that the external modules equivalently provide the desired display on the auxiliary unit. Irrespective of whether

one skilled in the art would have been motivated to modify Lowery in the manner suggested in the action, the combination would not have resulted in the claim 47 invention.

Specifically, the combination of Dawson and Lowery does not provide a teaching or suggestion of an auxiliary display unit configured to receive second information from an external network *associated with a second active application being run on the personal computer*, wherein the second information is displayed on the display of the auxiliary display unit and not on the main display unit. As discussed with respect to claim 1, Dawson merely shows that applications can be displayed on the remote system display 230 outside the shared display 216. These applications are local applications which are executed by the CPU 310 of the remote system 220 and not by the CPU 305 of the host system 300. Col. 6, ll. 58-61; Fig. 3. The external modules described in Lowery amount to nothing more than local applications, which are executed on the client computer. Indeed, Lowery says as much at col. 5, lines 22-28. Notably, Lowery states “[p]lug-ins are typically external modules or add-on programs *run on the client* which are used to provide various abilities.” (Emphasis supplied). Thus, Lowery does not receive second information from an external network *associated with a second active application being run on the personal computer*, wherein the second information is displayed on the display of the auxiliary display unit and not on the main display unit as recited in claim 47.

Moreover, Dawson does not contemplate that its remote system can connect to an external network responsive to instructions received from the host system, without connecting to the external network through the personal computer. Lowery does not remedy this defect of Dawson. At best, one might have modified Dawson to provide a modem in the remote system to connect to an external network responsive to instructions from the remote system CPU. However, Dawson is wholly devoid of any teaching or suggestion of a modem configured to couple the auxiliary display unit to the external network responsive to the instructions received by the processing unit from the personal computer, without connecting to the external network through the personal computer as called for in claim 47. Nor, at the time of instant invention, would one skilled in the art have had any motivation to modify Dawson or the combination of Dawson and Lowery to obtain the invention of claim 47 to include such a feature.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 47 as patentably distinguishable from the combination of Dawson and Lowery. Claims 48-53 are patentably distinct from Dawson and Lowery for the same reason as their base claim 47, and further in view of the additional advantageous features recited therein.

Claim 54

Claim 54 calls for a host computer having an operating system and an application stored thereon and configured to run the operating system and launch the application, a main display unit coupled to the host computer; and an auxiliary display unit coupled to the host computer and distinct from the main display unit, the auxiliary display unit configured to receive and display second information associated with a task bar or system tray of the operating system running on the host computer, wherein the second information is displayed on the auxiliary display unit and not on the main display unit.

The action applies the combination of Dawson and Lowery to reject claim 54. In this regard, the action contends that Dawson shows all the features of claim 54, but for the second information being displayed on the auxiliary display unit and not on the main display unit.

Notwithstanding, the action's contention, the combination of Dawson and Lowery does not provide a teaching or suggestion of an auxiliary display unit configured to receive second information associated with a task bar or system tray of *the operating system running on the host computer*, wherein the second information is displayed on the auxiliary display unit and not on the main display unit. Dawson merely shows that applications can be displayed on the remote system display 230 outside the shared display 216. These applications are local applications which are executed by the CPU 310 of the remote system 220 and not by the CPU 305 of the host system 300. Col. 6, ll. 58-61; Fig. 3. The external modules described in Lowery amount to nothing more than local applications, which are executed on the client computer. Indeed, Lowery says as much at col. 5, lines 22-28. Notably, Lowery states "[p]lug-ins are typically external modules or add-on programs *run on the client* which are used to provide various abilities." (Emphasis supplied). Thus, Lowery does not receive second information associated with a task bar or system tray of *the operating system running on the host computer*, wherein the second information is displayed on the auxiliary display unit and not on the main display unit as recited

in claim 54. In addition, a plug-in device certainly could not be the operating system running on the host computer.

In view of the foregoing, claim 54 is patentably distinct from the combination of Dawson and Lowery.

Claim 55

Regarding independent claim 55, since the combination of Dawson and Lowery does not teach or suggest displaying first information associated with an active application on the main display unit and displaying a graphical user interface portion associated with the active application on the display of the auxiliary display unit and not on the main display unit as recited in claim 28, the combination necessarily does not provide a teaching or suggestion of a computer readable medium having computer-executable instructions including displaying first information associated with a first active application on the main display unit and displaying a graphical user interface associated with a second active application on the display of the standalone auxiliary display unit, and not on the main display unit. Nor does the combination of Dawson and Lowery teach or suggest computer-executable instructions for displaying the second information associated with the application on the display of the standalone auxiliary display unit, and not on the main display unit as called for in claim 55.

Claims 20-24 and 26

Independent claim 20 is directed to a method of controlling the display of information associated with an active application in a computer system having a host computer, and a first display unit and second display unit coupled to the host computer. The claim 20 method includes determining whether the second display unit has available capacity to display information associated with the application, sending the information associated with the application to the second display unit for display when the second display unit has available capacity, and sending the information associated with the application to the first display unit for display when the second display unit has no available capacity to display the information.

Applicants agree with the action's assessment that Dawson does not disclose, teach or otherwise suggest the step of determining whether the second display unit has available capacity

to display information associated with the application. Nonetheless, the action contends that it would have been obvious to provide the step of determining whether a display unit has available capacity because Dawson indicates that display devices 205 and 225 can be any of a wide variety of conventional devices and one would have been motivated “to include the display unit with the desired capacity.”

The action’s position makes no sense in the context of the personal conferencing system of Dawson. While Dawson does indicate that the display devices may be any of a wide variety of conventional display devices, Dawson specifies that the display device be “a liquid crystal device, cathode ray tube or other display device suitable for creating graphic images and alphanumeric characters”. Col. 4, ll. 33-37. Thus, Dawson *avoids the need to determine whether the display of a remote system is capable of displaying information* by assuming that the wide variety of display devices which can be used with the personal conferencing system are, at minimum, capable of creating graphic images and alphanumeric character (i.e., have the “desired capacity” relied on by the action as motivation). Stated differently, Dawson does not contemplate that the display of the remote system would be incapable of (as opposed to capable of, but prohibited from) displaying information from the host system. Consequently, one would not have been motivated to modify Dawson in the manner suggested in the action to obtain the claim 20 invention.

Furthermore, Dawson does not contemplate that even if a remote system were capable of displaying information, at any point in time it may lack available capacity in terms of display real estate, to display information from the host system. According to Dawson, either an application is shared between the host and remote systems and identically displayed on the displays of both the host and remote system or the application is not shared.

For at least the above reasons, applicants submit that one skilled in the art would not have been motivated to modify Dawson in the manner suggested or otherwise to realize the invention of independent claim 20. Claims 21-23 and 26, which ultimately depend from claim 20, are patentably distinct from Dawson for the same reasons as claim 20, and further in view of the novel features recited therein. For example, claim 26 calls for the step of determining to include

Appln. No.: 09/556,982
Amendment dated April 8, 2004
Reply to Office Action of February 25, 2004

determining whether the second display unit has sufficient display space to display the information. Dawson does not teach or suggest such a feature.

CONCLUSION


It is believed that no fee is required for this submission. If any fees are required or if an overpayment is made, the Commissioner is authorized to debit or credit our Deposit Account No. 19-0733, accordingly. All rejections having been addressed, applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: April 8, 2004

By:



Gary D. Fedorochko
Registration No. 35,509

1001 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001